

|   |                                      |  |  |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/500,146 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>KATAYAMA, YASUSHI |  |
|   | <b>Examiner</b><br>JEFFREY NICKERSON | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2442                  |  |

**All Participants:**

(1) JEFFREY NICKERSON.

(2) Brian Epstein (60,329).

**Date of Interview:** 24 March 2010

**Status of Application:** Non-Finally Rejected

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** 1:00pm

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*None*

Claims discussed:

*1, 10, 14, 23*

Prior art documents discussed:

*None*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Examiner Nickerson asserted that there was a Lack of Unity between claims 1, 14 and claims 10, 23. Applicant successfully argued that the newly added judgement value amended into claims 1, 14 was a broader version of the return probability value in claims 10,23. Examiner Nickerson withdrew the lack of unity requirement..